

HUTT CITY COUNCILKOMITI HANGANGA  
INFRASTRUCTURE AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held in the Council Chambers, 2nd Floor,  
30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt on  
**Thursday, 13 March 2025, commencing at 2:00pm**

---

**PRESENT:** Cr S Edwards (Chair) Cr T Stallinger (Deputy Chair)  
Cr G Barratt Cr K Brown (until 4.22pm)  
Cr B Dyer Deputy Mayor T Lewis  
Cr A Mitchell

**APOLOGIES:** Mayor C Barry and Cr G Tupou

**IN ATTENDANCE:** A Geddes, Director Environment and Sustainability  
J Kingsbury, Director Economy and Development  
E Anand, Head of City Delivery (via audio-visual link)  
P Hewitt, Head of Transport  
T Johnstone, Head of Planning (part meeting)  
J Roberts, Head of Environmental Protection (part meeting)  
E Scherer, Transport Engineering Manager (part meeting)  
R Lemalu, Project Delivery Manger (part meeting)  
D Kennedy, Transport Project Manager (part meeting)  
B Hodgins, Strategic Advisor (part meeting)  
N Hardie, Building Consents Manager (part meeting)  
H Bell, Elected Member Support Coordinator (part meeting)  
V Gilmour, Democracy Advisor  
H Clegg, Minute Taker

PUBLIC BUSINESS**1. OPENING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA TIMATANGA**

Whakataka te hau ki te uru	Cease the winds from the west
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga	Cease the winds from the south
Kia mākinakina ki uta	Let the breeze blow over the land
Kia mātaratara ki tai	Let the breeze blow over the ocean
E hī ake ana te atākura	Let the red-tipped dawn come with a
He tio, he huka, he hau hū	sharpened air.
Tihei mauri ora	A touch of frost, a promise of a
	glorious day.

2. **APOLOGIES**

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Edwards/Cr Barratt)

**Minute No. IARCC 25101**

*"That the apologies received from Mayor Barry and Cr Tupou be accepted and leave of absence be granted."*

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Comments are recorded under the item to which they relate.

4. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS**

There were no conflict of interest declarations.

5. **RECOMMENDATION TO TE KAUNIHERA O TE AWA KAIRANGI  
COUNCIL - 25 March 2025**

## Setting of Speed Limits 2024 - Speed Limit Changes around schools and Marine Drive

Speaking under public comment, **Belinda Moss, Chair of Eastbourne Community Board**, asked that the 50km/h speed limit along Marine Drive be maintained due to changes in land use from the construction of Tupua Horo Nuku. She noted that a recent review had reduced the speed limit from 70km/h to 50km/h following community feedback about increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic. She highlighted that existing concrete barriers hindered prams, cycles, and wheelchairs, requiring more time to navigate the area. She raised concerns about the feasibility of planned pedestrian crossings if the speed limit were increased to 70km/h and emphasised that the current limit had improved safety on Marine Drive.

In response to a question from a member, Belinda Moss believed the Principal of Wellesley College was satisfied with the current variable speed limit near the school.

The Chair read a written comment by **Murray Reed** attached as page 15 to the minutes.

Speaking under public comment, **Clare Kernot, representing Mahina Bay Residents' Association** (the Association), stated that a 2021 survey showed 75% of respondents supported the 50km/h speed limit. She asked for additional speed deterrents, such as double yellow lines and speed cameras, and expressed residents' relief at the limit and concerns over pedestrian crossings with a higher speed limit.

Speaking under public comment, **Anna Sutherland and Susan Ewart, representing the York Bay Residents' Association**, asked that the 50km/h speed limit be retained. Anna Sutherland mentioned that the Tupua Horo Nuku construction enhanced the beach and encouraged public transport use, as new developments no longer required on-site parking. She expressed concerns that concrete barriers hindered access to the shared pathway and emphasised the importance of lower vehicle speeds for the safety of non-motorised users, especially given that 14 driveways in York Bay directly connect to Marine Drive.

Susan Ewart highlighted the increase in pedestrians and kayakers using the pathway to access the beach. She mentioned that the main entry point in York Bay did not align with the road intersection, forcing users to walk along the road. Additionally, she noted that inconsistent speed limits on Marine Drive had caused confusion and suggested maintaining a consistent 50 km/h limit.

In response to a question from a member, Anna Sutherland stated that a 50km/h speed limit on Marine Drive would enhance safety, even without a shared pathway. Susan Ewart noted that elderly residents in York Bay struggled to cross Marine Drive due to high vehicle speeds.

The Head of Transport elaborated on the report. He confirmed that the Land

Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2022 permitted exceptions to the requirement that all speed limits changed under the 2022 rule must revert to their original limits. He noted that Tupua Horo Nuku could significantly change land use.

In response to questions from members, the Head of Transport:

- confirmed that a condition of consent for Tupua Horo Nuku required a review of speed limits. He said this had been completed, reducing the speed limit to 50km/h. He added that the review had factored in the future development of Tupua Horo Nuku at the time.
- if the speed limit change were deemed justified based on a significant land use change, the requirements outlined in paragraph 7 of the report would not apply.
- officers intended to visit all school sites to assess entrances and speed limit sign locations before engaging with schools on potential changes. Council had extensively consulted schools following the 2022 rule changes, leading to the reduction of speed limits near most schools. The maps in the report were in draft form and could have potential adjustments after discussions with each school.
- agreed that transparency in discussions with schools was essential and noted that all councils in New Zealand were facing the same situation. Using existing signposts, rather than installing new ones, was preferred, and lessons had been learned from the previous rollout of speed limits.
- limited resources were available to carry out this mandatory but unfunded work. The safety of children would always be a priority. However, other projects may need to be deferred to prioritise this work.

Cr Mitchell proposed new parts (3) and (4), agreeing that officers would work with schools to implement changes that comply with the Land Transport Rule - Setting Speed Limits 2024 and to maintain the 50km/h speed limit on Marine Drive.

Cr Brown supported retaining the 50km/h speed limit on Marine Drive. She questioned the necessity of consulting with schools when the government mandate required speed limits to revert to pre-2022 levels. She noted that most schools had already participated in prior consultations and supported the lower speed limits. She expressed concern that Council had lost the ability to support schools in their efforts to maintain reduced speed limits.

Cr Mitchell emphasised the need for clear communication on the process to schools, which could simplify speed limits. He advocated for consistent drop-off and pick-up times for speed limit signage to reduce confusion for drivers. He also supported the proposed 50km/h limit for Marine Drive.

Cr Stallinger expressed support for the 50km/h speed limit for Marine Drive, highlighting safety concerns due to the numerous driveways directly accessing the road.

Cr Dyer expressed concern about the government mandating unfunded work. He noted that the new speed limits from the 2022 rule changes had not

significantly affected travel times but had enhanced student safety. He urged officers to prioritise safety while adhering to the new rules and advocated for clear communication with schools regarding the reasons for the changes.

**RECOMMENDED:** (Cr Edwards/Cr Mitchell)

**Minute No. IARCC 25102**

*"That the Committee recommends that Council:*

- (1) receives and notes the information;*
- (2) notes that the reversal of reduced speed limits and the installation of variable speed limits is required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2024;*
- (3) approves officers to work with schools to make changes that comply with the Land Transport Rule - Setting Speed Limits 2024 and maximise the safety of students travelling to and from school; and*
- (4) directs officers to complete the work required to maintain Marine Drive at 50km/h due to the significant change of land use since the speed was lowered in accordance with the Eastbourne Speed review, which was a consent condition for Tupua Horo Nuku."*

6. **WATER FILLING STATIONS AND FOOTPATH IMPROVEMENTS - WAIU STREET, WAINUIOMATA, MARINE PARADE, PETONE AND WINGATE CRESCENT, NAENAE**

Report No. IARCC2025/1/44 by the Traffic Engineer

The Head of Transport elaborated on the report.

The Strategic Advisor noted that Wellington Water Ltd (WWL) was conducting the work on behalf of Council and that it was included in the budget.

In response to questions from members, the Strategic Advisor confirmed that tankers could use existing hydrants after applying to WWL for each instance. He acknowledged that unauthorised usage had likely occurred and that WWL was committed to stricter enforcement. He noted that monitoring hydrant use at night posed challenges.

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Edwards/Cr Stallinger)

**Minute No. IARCC 25103**

*"That the Committee:*

- (1) receives and notes the information;*
- (2) approves the installation of one new bulk water filling station outside 21 Waiu Street, Wainuiomata, as outlined in Appendix 1 to the report;*
- (3) approves the installation of one new bulk water filling station at the corner of Marine Parade and Kirkcaldy Street, Petone, as outlined in Appendix 2 to the report;*
- (4) approves the installation of one new bulk water filling station approximately 60m south of the Wingate Bridge on Wingate Crescent, Naenae, as outlined in Appendix 3 to the report;*
- (5) approves the following improvements in Petone and Wainuiomata:*
  - a) relocation of the footpath in Wainuiomata, shifting it from the east to the west, ensuring a minimum width of 1.5m, as outlined in Appendix 1 to the report;*
  - b) relocation of the footpath in Petone, shifting it from the south to the north, ensuring a minimum width of 1.5m, as outlined in Appendix 2 to the report; and*
  - c) replacing the existing footpath and grassed area in Petone with a vehicle access layby as outlined in Appendix 2 to the report;*
- (6) rescinds any previous resolutions related to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they conflict with the traffic controls described in this recommendation; and*
- (7) notes that the changes will take effect once the traffic control devices indicating the recommended restrictions have been installed."*

## 7. THREE WATERS UPDATE

Report No. IARCC2025/1/42 by the Strategic Advisor

The Strategic Advisor elaborated on the report and provided the following updates:

- paragraph 3 – the latest year-end forecast was now \$75.7M, with \$3M in savings achieved without reducing the programme. Savings were due to contingency amounts not being required for three projects and timing adjustments in other projects.
- paragraph 5 – Wellington Water Ltd (WWL) had provided initial cost estimates for pipeline renewals completed over the past 22 months, ranging from \$1M to \$4M per kilometre. These figures included all associated costs. Cost variations were attributed to location, depth, number of connections, ground conditions, pipe size and construction methods. The Chief Executive of WWL advised that a detailed analysis could only be conducted for current projects and those completed within the past 12 months.
- paragraph 6 – the total number of backlogged leaks was 110, and the current budget resourcing was sufficient to maintain this level.
- paragraphs 9 and 10 – the total cost had been reduced to \$135,000.

The Strategic Advisor indicated that revenue from the second tranche of commercial water rates was projected to be \$500,000 higher than anticipated.

In response to member questions, the Strategic Advisor confirmed that;

- increased funding for pipe renewals resulted from deferring other projects.
- WWL would be asked to provide the average cost per kilometre for pipe renewals over the past three years.
- funding for the water meter project was included in next year's budget.
- current work involved input from all Iwi partners with monthly meetings. A business case was in development and expected to be finalised in six weeks, followed by a detailed report for Council consideration.

In response to questions from members, the Strategic Advisor explained that the decrease in bulk water usage was due to leak repairs. However, Council's percentage of bulk water use had not decreased as much as neighbouring councils, so fees have not dropped proportionally. He would ask that WWL include the number of leaks fixed in its regular reports.

RESOLVED: (Cr Edwards/Cr Mitchell)

**Minute No. IARCC 25104**

*"That the Committee receives the report and notes the information."*

## 8. MICROMOBILITY PROGRAMME UPDATE

Report No. IARCC2025/1/45 by the Transport Project Manager

The Transport Project Manager shared a presentation attached as pages 16-18 to the minutes.

In response to questions from a member, the Project Delivery Manager explained that the proposed pedestrian crossing near Avalon Park had been removed due to the absence of confirmation regarding speed limit changes in the area. She noted that pedestrian crossings were prohibited on roads with a speed limit of 70km/h.

The Director of Economy and Development noted that the pathway connecting the Beltway to RiverLink may have been inadvertently omitted from the maps. He agreed to provide an update on its current status. He acknowledged the members' frustrations, explaining that the Taitā Connection was meant to link cycle routes, but it did not accomplish this goal.

In response to questions from members, the Transport Project Manager explained that the Taitā project had been divided into two phases for procurement purposes. He confirmed that the Avalon project would commence on 17 March 2025. Stage 1 of the Taitā project would commence on 18 July 2025, followed by Stage 2, due to commence on 22 August 2025. He confirmed costs were \$1.9M for Avalon and \$3.9M for Taitā, contributing to an overall budget of \$7.28M. The Head of Transport also mentioned that a portion of the budget was allocated for a strategic review of cycleways.

In response to questions from members, the Project Delivery Manager confirmed that some raised crossing platforms could be retained and agreed to report back on the proposed locations.

The Transport Project Manager acknowledged concerns regarding the proposed parking changes on Walter Street, which could reduce the carriageway to one-way traffic. He agreed to reassess the proposal and the width of the proposed bus stop shown on the map attached as page 18 to the minutes.

In response to a question from a member, the Project Delivery Manager confirmed that the zebra crossing's proposed location on the map, attached as page 19 to the minutes, could be adjusted for better alignment. She also stated that barriers restricting cycle access on pathways would be reassessed for removal.

Cr Mitchell suggested that the crossings at both ends of the project (Oxford Terrace, High Street, and Avalon) be maintained as raised dual platforms due to these roads' high-speed, high-traffic nature. He asked that five raised platform crossings be preserved across both projects. He also emphasised the importance of providing maps promptly for adequate assessment by the members.

The Director of Economy and Development indicated that a report on reinstating raised platform crossings, including cost estimates, could be considered by Council at its meeting on 25 March 2025.



Cr Barratt mentioned that parking issues on Walter Street had been ongoing for years and suggested that converting it to a one-way could serve as a long term solution.

Cr Brown questioned the rationale for reinstating raised platform crossings, emphasising that many areas in the city needed them for safety. She expressed support for the Taitā and Avalon proposals.

Cr Stallinger expressed concern about whether these projects would set a precedent for the city and how raised platform crossings would be assessed, especially considering budget constraints.

The Director of Economy and Development stated that any proposals for raised platform crossings would need Committee approval because of cost implications. He mentioned that the original project design was created when 90% of the funding was external and included higher-quality design features.

The Chair supported completing a micromobility project within the limited budget, suggesting that future assessments could be conducted for other areas of the city.

Cr Dyer asked for clarification regarding removing the raised platform crossing at Tocker Street. He believed it was necessary as part of a traffic calming and Speed Reduction Strategy. He proposed that a speed hump be considered in place of the crossing instead.

Members agreed that part (4) of the officer's recommendations – "*approves option (a) changes to Community Connections (Avalon and Taitā) designs as noted in the officer's report*" - should be referred to the Council meeting on 25 March 2025.

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Edwards/Cr Dyer)

**Minute No. IARCC 25105**

*"That the Committee:*

- (1) *receives and notes the report;*
- (2) *notes that the Micromobility Programme – Community Connections (Avalon and Taitā) Designs for Approval was considered by the Infrastructure and Regulatory Committee at its meeting on 23 November 2023 (report IARCC2023/5/360);*
- (3) *notes that the Micromobility report was considered by the Long Term Plan/ Annual Plan Subcommittee at its meeting on 26 August 2024 (report LTPAP2024/4/235) and has recommended the approval of a \$7.28M unsubsidised budget over the 2024-2027 Long Term Plan period; and*
- (4) *endorses the Micromobility Programme update."*

9. **PROPOSED TEMPORARY ROAD CLOSURE, REYNOLDS BACH DRIVE, STOKES VALLEY - HUTT VALLEY MOTORSPORT CLUB HILL CLIMB EVENT | 2025 - 2027**

Report No. IARCC2025/1/41 by the Transport Engineering Manager

The Head of Transport elaborated on the report.

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Edwards/Cr Stallinger)

**Minute No. IARCC 25106**

*"That the Committee:*

- (1) *receives and notes the information;*
- (2) *agrees to temporarily close the following section of Reynolds Bach Drive, Stokes Valley, from the 'gates' to the end of Reynolds Bach Drive;*
  - a) *Hutt Valley Motorsport Club Hill Climb – 2025:  
Friday, 18 April 2025 (Good Friday) from 7:00am to 6:00pm (attached as Appendix 2 to the report);*
  - b) *Hutt Valley Motorsport Club Hill Climb – 2026:  
Friday, 3 April 2026 (Good Friday) from 7:00am to 6:00pm (attached as Appendix 2 to the report); and*
  - c) *Hutt Valley Motorsport Club Hill Climb – 2027:  
Friday, 26 March 2027 (Good Friday) from 7:00am to 6:00pm (attached as Appendix 2 to the report); and*
- (3) *notes that during the event, this resolution will rescind any previous resolutions related to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw, to the extent that they conflict with the traffic controls outlined in these resolutions."*

10. **REGULATORY MATTERS**

Report No. IARCC2025/1/43 by the Head of Building Control

Cr Brown left the meeting at 3.35pm.

The Director of Environment and Sustainability highlighted that the latest IANZ report confirmed that the building team was making good progress, had a strong structure, and had been reclassified as low-risk.

Cr Brown rejoined the meeting at 3.39pm.

In response to questions from members, the Building Consents Manager stated that the current operating system would be discontinued in 2026. She mentioned that investigations into two potential replacement systems were ongoing and emphasised that efforts were being made to address any possible transition issues.

The Head of Planning confirmed that many subdivision consent applications were submitted before the new Development Contributions Policy took effect, and several remained on hold.

The Director Economy and Development stated that the timeframes for the Tupua Horo Nuku project were being reassessed to stay as close to the original schedule as possible.

In response to questions from members, the Head of Environmental Protection informed that officers were communicating with operators that the government had established the new Food Licensing levy. Additionally, he attributed the decline in parking infringement numbers to a directive from the Ministry of Transport, which required higher fines for serious offenses and challenges related to staff resourcing.

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Edwards/Deputy Mayor Lewis)

**Minute No. IARCC 25107**

*"That the Committee receives and notes the information."*

## 11. ECONOMY AND DEVELOPMENT - DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Report No. IARCC2025/1/1 by the Director of Economy and Development

The Director of Economy and Development elaborated on the report, noting that the Hikoikoi project had been unintentionally excluded. He also confirmed that a briefing for members would take place on 2 April 2025.

The Head of Transport elaborated on the Temporary Traffic Management section. He noted that officers were engaging with neighbouring councils and that all current trials were associated with projects rather than maintenance work. He emphasised that high-volume road projects still need site-specific traffic management plans for Council approval. He recognised that moving away from the previous system would take time for the industry.

The Director of Economy and Development highlighted the high traffic management costs under previous regulations, often exceeding project costs. He reiterated that health and safety were top priorities and suggested temporarily closing roads to allow simultaneous project completion, reducing disruption.

In response to a question from a member, the Head of Transport indicated that traffic management costs were not expected to decrease in the short term, although savings might be realised in the longer term.

The Director Economy and Development confirmed that the Strategic Cycling Network Plan and the Cycling Strategy (the strategy) referred to the initiative for connecting micromobility projects. He noted that internal workshops were recently conducted and a report for members would be available soon. He added that a draft strategy was expected later this year.

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Edwards/Cr Barratt)

**Minute No. IARCC 25108**

*"That the Committee receives and notes the information."*

**12. INFORMATION ITEM****Infrastructure and Regulatory Forward Programme 2025**

Memorandum dated 18 February 2025 by the Democracy Advisor

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Edwards/Cr Stallinger)

**Minute No. IARCC 25109**

*"That the Committee receives and notes the Forward Programme for 2025 attached as Appendix 1 to the memorandum."*

**13. QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

**14. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED:** (Cr Edwards/Deputy Mayor Lewis)

**Minute No. IARCC 25110**

*"That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:*

15. *Infrastructure Acceleration Fund Update h*

*The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:*

(A)	(B)	(C)
<i>General subject of the matter to be considered.</i>	<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter.</i>	<i>Ground under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution.</i>
<i>Infrastructure Acceleration Fund Update.</i>	<i>The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities (s7(2)(h)).</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exist.</i>

*This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as specified in Column (B) above."*

There being no further business, the Chair declared the public part of the meeting closed at 4.02pm. The public excluded part of the meeting was declared closed at 4.25pm.

S Edwards  
**CHAIR**

**CONFIRMED as a true and correct record**  
**Dated this 25th day of March 2025**

**Public comment**

How come the speed limit for the eastern bays is back on the agenda? Apparently it is to be discussed by the Hutt City Council Meeting on the 13th of March. The speed limit was set after years of consultation, discussions, surveys, and rational consideration.

Indeed, the grand and wonderful pathway project around the bays had as a condition for consent that the speed limit be reduced to its current 50km. This was because of safety concerns for those who are being encouraged to come and visit the bays using the new recreational pathway.

We, the residents, strongly supported the change. How is it that the matter is back on the agenda? Silly, ill-considered government intervention seems to be the only reason.

Murray Reed



### Avalon & Taitā Connected Community's Shared Path

Infrastructure and Regulatory  
Committee

13 March 2025



### Background

- Formally known as Magic Triangle, Naenae has since been removed from scope
- Designs approved for Avalon and Taitā, however NZTA CERF funding paused November 2023
- HCC approved a self-funded budget August 2024



### Proposed Design Changes

- Converting raised platform crossings to road level crossings
- Design changes align with Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 1 July 2024
- Future maintenance of raised pedestrian crossings will not receive any NZTA subsidies
- Still aligns with climate change goals by promoting low-emission, sustainable transport that supports wellbeing



### Avalon Raised Vs Level Crossing Cost Estimates



RAISED CROSSING VS  
LEVEL CROSSING  
DIFFERENCE \$71,469.33  
(PER CROSSING)



TIMEFRAME  
DIFFERENCE OF 50 DAYS



TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT  
DIFFERENCE \$122,450



TOTAL PROJECT  
DIFFERENCE \$726,101.81





---

## Maintenance Cost Example



- 3353 High St
- Raised Dual Crossing
- Asset age – 3 years
- Repair cost \$2,306.66
- TTM cost estimate \$4,688.34

**Kia ora  
Thank You**



